REFERENCE COPY

CHILD CARE AND THE WORKING PARENT

A STUDY OF THE CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF EMPLOYEES IN THE MINISTRY OF TREASURY, ECONOMICS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

HV
861
.C3
.R68

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Ontario Council of University Libraries

https://archive.org/details/childcareworking00ross

ec4x

"CHILD CARE AND THE WORKING PARENT"

A Study of the Child Care Arrangements
of Employees in the Ministry of Treasury,
Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs

Ontario Ministry of Treasury,
Economics and Intergovernmental
Affairs Library
DEC 2 1976
79/636-0
LIBRARY

Copies of the complete and abridged versions of this report are available from the Office of the Women's Coordinator, Frost Building South, 5th floor, 965-1979

Prepared by Ruth Ross
for the Affirmative Action
Program in the Ministry of
Treasury, Economics and
Intergovernmental Affairs
December, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	REPORT HIGHLIGHTS	i
II.	THE STUDY	
	INTRODUCTION	1
	TURNOVER AND LOSS	2
	SAMPLE SELECTION	2
	DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH DESIGN AND SCHEDULE	4
	CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE	4
	Sex and Age Distribution	4
	Work Position	5
	Education Level	6
	One or Two Parent Family	7
	Age and Education Level of Spouse	7
	Gross Family Income	8
	Age and Number of Children	8
	CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS	9
	Type of Arrangements	9
	Cost of Child Care	10
	EFFECT OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS ON STAFF PRODUCTIVITY AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES	11
	Responsibility for Transportation	11
	Flexibility of Hours of Arrangements	13
	Overtime Work	13
	Job Opportunities	14
	Travelling	14
	Training and Development	15
	Absenteeism	15
	Changes in Arrangements: Permanent, Summer and Emergency	17
	Concern about Arrangements	18
	Desired Changes in Arrangements	19
	Family Budget Constraints	19
	Family Relationships	19
	Arrangements for Illness of Child	20
	Plans for Breakdown of Arrangements	21
	Location of Child Care Arrangements	23
III.	ADDITIONAL INTERVIEWS	
	INTERVIEWS WITH MANAGERS	23
	INTERVIEWS WITH REGIONAL OFFICES	24
IV.	CONCLUSIONS	25
	APPENDIX A TEIA Daycare Advisory Committee	29
	APPENDIX B Preliminary Survey through Women's Advisory Committee	30
	APPENDIX C Accounting Design	33
	APPENDIX D Interview Format and Coding Instructions	34
	APPENDIX E Interview Questions for Managers	46
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	47

I. REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- One out of every five TEIA employees must arrange the care of at least one child under thirteen years of age, during his or her working hours.

- Almost half of the respondents took time off work during the past six months because of their children's illnesses. 28% of the respondents took time off work during the past six months because their child care arrangements had broken down. A total of 55 work days had been lost over the past six months for the forty respondents - 40 days for children's illnesses and 15 days because of breakdowns in arrangements. Projected for the population, this means that T.E.I.A. lost 192 work days over the six-month period for emergency child care reasons.

- One third of the respondents had encountered difficulty in making emergency arrangements. Many of them did not know about agencies which provide emergency service.

- One third found the costs of their child care arrangements caused financial difficulties.

- One third found their child care arrangements a strain on the relationship with their spouse.

- One third worried about the adequacy of their child care arrangements while on the job.

- Almost a quarter of the respondents were unwilling to leave their present jobs because of their child care arrangements. The important factor here was having a supervisor sympathetic to the problems of working parents. Some were afraid that a new job might involve more overtime work than their present job now required or that they might lose their present flexibility of work hours.

- 83% of the respondents had taken work-related courses. A quarter of them, both men and women, felt that their child care arrangements had interfered with this effort. There were many problems connected with making additional child care arrangements; i.e. dependable arrangements were difficult to find, child care expenses increased. Out-of-town courses presented even greater difficulties, particularly for single mothers. One solution to these difficulties was daytime courses. Respondents who did not have problems taking courses attributed this to daytime courses.

- To compensate for absences due to child care difficulties, some employees were allowed to use sick leave benefits; however, this practice was not applied uniformly throughout the Ministry. Contract employees generally were not covered by sick leave benefits and lost their pay.

- Few differences were found between male and female employees in the effects on productivity and career opportunities where male employees also had child care responsibilities (i.e. a working wife). When differences did occur, women employees were more disadvantaged than men in three areas: staying at home to care for a sick child: moving to a new job; taking our-of-town or evening courses.

II. THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Participation in the Canadian labour force by women with young children is rapidly becoming a commonplace occurrence. Nineteen percent of women with pre-school children only had entered the labour force by 1967; by 1973 this was up to 29%.[1] The change was even more pronounced for women with only school-aged children. Their workforce participation rate increased from 28% to 42% over the same time period. Women in the same age group (from 20 years to 54 years) without children had a participation rate of 67% in 1973. Thus, in 1973, working mothers accounted for approximately 34% of the female labour force and 12% of the total labour force. It is probable that this trend is still underway.

The introduction of women with young children into the workforce in sizable numbers brings with it a whole series of new concerns. In order for them to go to work, alternate child care arrangements must be set up and maintained. This often presents problems both for women, traditionally the ones responsible for child care, and for men, who are becoming increasingly involved in this aspect of family life. Dependable, good-quality care is desirable but difficult to find. Costs are often high and locations not always convenient. Even once satisfactory regular arrangements have been found, emergency arrangements often present difficulties as do the sometimes conflicting demands of job and child care responsibilities. Making and maintaining child care arrangements is often not an easy task for parents.

As part of the Affirmative Action Plan to provide employment opportunities for women in the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, the Office of the Women's Coordinator conducted a small-scale research study to identify the problems experienced by both female and male employees in their effort to combine a job in the Ministry with child care responsibilities. The terms of reference for the study, inluded in the Affirmative Action Plan for the period September 1975 - March 1977, were as follows:

> A study to determine to what degree the daycare arrangements of T.E.I.A. employees affect staff productivity, turnover, and loss -- whether daycare arrangements allow employees to take advantage of career opportunities; to what degree and in what manner would their productivity (Ministry and Government productivity) be enhanced by expansion or improvement of their daycare arrangements.

[1] All figures from the Economic Council of Canada. People and Jobs. Ottawa, 1976, p.162.

A graduate student from the University of Toronto's Faculty of Social Work was hired for the summer to conduct a child care study. A Daycare Advisory Committee consisting of four Ministry employees, the Women's Coordinator and the research student was set up to assist with the study. (See Appendix A.)

TURNOVER AND LOSS

Employee records kept by the Personnel Branch do not reflect whether the reason for leaving the Ministry is a problem with child care arrangements. However, Personnel was able to provide records on employees taking maternity leave during 1975 and 1976, up to July. During 1975, 11 women went on maternity leave and all returned to employment with the Ministry. Up to July 1976, five women took maternity leave. At the time of writing, two had returned to the Ministry and three were still on leave.

Informal discussions between the Women's Coordinator and half of these women indicate that they have used or plan to use the services of the Ontario Government's employee daycare counsellor to seek assistance with their arrangements. Two of the 11 taking leave in 1975 are now working on a regular part-time basis, three days a week, to cover their work and parenting responsibilities. Some of the others are considering similar arrangements.

SAMPLE SELECTION

Since there were no Ministry records noting which employees had children, collecting this information was the first step undertaken. A letter was sent out to each of the thirty-three members of T.E.I.A.'s Women's Advisory Committee describing the study and asking them to survey the staff in their sections in order to determine which employees had children and what the children's ages were. (See Appendix B for letter and form.) Men and women, both regular and contract staff, were surveyed.

All of the forms were returned. One hundred and ninety-nine employees, more than half of these men, were listed. It is likely that these were not all the employees working for T.E.I.A. who had children, however no known non-response bias could be determined. Their children were of all ages since no cutoff age had been noted on the form or letter. It was decided after a review of the literature to set the cutoff age at twelve years old; the study took, as its population, all the employees in T.E.I.A. who had any children twelve years or younger and who had identified themselves on the form. This cutoff age was arbitrary. Other studies have used various ages: 12 years, 14 years, 16 years, 18 years. The legal age for leaving children at home without supervision is ten years old, however it was felt that this was too young a cutoff age for the study. People whose children were all over twelve years old were omitted because of the action-based orientation of this study. Parents with all their children over twelve years old, although they may have had problems in the past, no longer had these problems. People who did not have children but were intending to do so and those presently expecting children were also excluded. These

omissions occurred because the Office of the Women's Coordinator felt that including a question on the initial form concerning intentions to have children might be offensive to some employees. Another justification for excluding prospective parents was that they had not as yet actually had to deal with the problems, therefore they could not know how it really would affect them. Unfortunately, by excluding at the same time those in the process of seeking out child care arrangements for the first time, valuable information about the difficulties and frustrations involved was lost. According to some parents, the attempt to get infant child care can be the most trying experience of all. Some prospective parents contacted the Office of the Women's Coordinator, expressing interest in being part of the study. However, including people who asked to participate would have biased the study.

One hundred and fifty-five of the 199 people who were listed on the forms had children twelve years of age or younger. Fourteen of these were from regional offices and were looked at separately; the rest, 91 men and 50 women, made up the population. The sample size was set at forty persons. It was felt that the proportion of men in the population was too high for a simple random sample; this was a child care study and, given our present society, child care is most often the woman's responsibility. (This was borne out in the subsequent search for men employees who had child care arrangements other than wife at home.) It was decided to take 70% women and 30% men. A list of all the women in the population was drawn up and twenty-eight names were chosen using a random number table. The men were chosen in a slightly different manner. It was decided to include only those men whose wives were working. The rationale was that those with wives at home did not have the problems involved with arranging and maintaining outside child care arrangements. In addition, given the small numbers of men in the study, it was felt that including both men whose wives worked and those whose wives remained at home would result in sub-samples too small to be useful. The men in the study were selected by ordering their names via a random number table and choosing the first twelve men whose wives worked. They were contacted by telephone in order to get this information. It was necessary to contact thirty men to get the twelve men needed for the study. Half of the thirty had spouses who stayed home with the children. Three more had working spouses but were not included in the study because the spouse had not started work as yet or because she worked hours that made the arrangements of child care unnecessary.

Fourteen of the 155 persons with children twelve years old or younger were not included in the population. These were the people from the regional offices. It was decided to separate them from the Toronto respondents and to interview them all. Of the fourteen, eleven were men and three, women. Eight of the eleven men had spouses at home with the children; the other three had working wives. These three were interviewed, as were two of the women. The third was on holidays and therefore was not available for the study. The results from these interviews were not included in the statistical analysis.

In addition to the main study, five managers were contacted and interviewed either in person or over the telephone about any difficulties encountered with their employees and their child care arrangements.

Development of Research Design and Schedule

When a review of the pertinent literature was done, it was discovered that this study was probably unique in the particular slant it proposed. None of the other day care studies investigated the conflicting demands of child care and job responsibilities; most were day care needs studies. The few day care articles that dealt directly with the issue of worker productivity only discussed the effect of company day care centres on absenteeism and turnover and were not particularly useful. The literature did, however, give valuable information about many of the important variables for a child care study.

Constructing measures of staff productivity was perhaps the most difficult part of this study. Most of the literature on productivity was inapplicable. This was not a study where change would be introduced and before and after measures of productivity taken. Besides, the type of work performed at T.E.I.A. did not lend itself to the measures of productivity that had been used. New measures had to be constructed.

A conceptual model for the study was developed. (See Appendix C.) From this, an interview schedule was designed. Pretests were carried out and the necessary modifications made. (See Appendix D for final interview schedule and coding instructions.) All interviews were conducted by the research student and lasted approximately 20 minutes. There were no refusals.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

Sex and Age Distribution

The numbers of men and women in the sample were determined in advance. Twenty-eight respondents, 70% were female; twelve, 30% were male.

Most of the people in the study, 87.5% of them, ranged in age from twenty-five years to forty years. Only one was younger; four were between forty and fifty. No one was under twenty years or over fifty years old.

Table 1 - Age of Respondents

Age in Years	N	%
Total	40	100.0
20 - 24	1	2.5
25 - 29	8	20.0
30 - 34	17	42.5
35 - 39	10	25.0
40 - 44	3	7.5
45 - 49	1	2.5

There was no significant difference in age between the men and women although the men tended to be slightly older. For example, while there were no men under 30 years, nine women were in this age group.

Work Position

Each respondent was placed in one of three categories, managerial/supervisory, professional/technical or secretarial/clerical, a categorization presently in use at T.E.I.A. This information was determined from the Workforce Analysis Program Summary Sheets in the Office of the Women's Coordinator, or from the Personnel Department in the few cases where the information was not available on the sheets.

Five of the respondents, 12.5% of the sample, were in the managerial/supervisory category. In the professional/technical category there were fourteen respondents, 35.5% of the sample. The majority, twenty-one of the forty respondents (52.5%), were in the secretarial/clerical category.

There appeared to be a difference in the distribution of men and women in the three categories. The managerial/supervisory category with 12.5% of the total sample, contained 25.0% of the men compared to only 7.1% of the women. The secretarial/clerical category contained 52.5% of the total sample; 60.7% of the women compared to only 33.3% of the men. [2]

[2] The small numbers in the managerial/supervisory category precluded testing the hypothesis that males were overrepresented at the managerial/supervisory level, women at the secretarial/clerical one. When the testing was done merging the managerial/supervisory and the professional/technical categories and comparing them to the secretarial/clerical category, it was found that there was no significant difference between sexes; there was no difference between the two groupings with respect to the proportion of men and women in each. Since the difference was not as great at the professional/technical level, it is likely that combining the two categories masked the difference that was there.

Table 2 - Work Position by Sex

Position	Sex of Respondent				Total	
	Male		Female			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mgr./Supr.	3	25.0	2	7.1	5	12.5
Prof./Tech.	5	41.7	9	32.1	14	35.0
Sec./Cler.	4	33.3	17	60.7	21	52.5
	12	100.0	28	99.9	40	100.0

Education Level

Forty percent of the sample, sixteen persons, had high school level education. Thirteen of these had completed high school; three had completed some high school education. The remaining 60% had further education. Ten of these had completed their first degree in university, one had post-secondary, non-university training and the remaining thirteen had education beyond the first university degree or equivalent education, for example, professional training.

Table 3 - Education Level of Respondents

Level	N	%
Total	40	100.0
Some high school	3	7.5
Completed high school	13	32.5
Post-secondary, non-university	1	2.5
University, 1st degree	10	25.0
University, beyond 1st degree	13	32.5

Every respondent with high school level education was in the secretarial/clerical category, as were five with university degrees. The rest were mixed proportionally between the professional/technical and the managerial/supervisory categories.

Educational level varied by sex. Women were overrepresented at a high school level, underrepresented at the first university degree level. Men were the opposite, underrepresented at a high school level and overrepresented at the first degree level. This distinction did not hold true for higher degrees. Both women and men were equally represented at an educational level beyond the first university degree.

One Parent or Two Parent Family

Eighty-five percent of the respondents, thirty-four people, lived with their spouses. Another 12.5% (5 people) were single mothers. The remaining respondent was a man living apart from his wife and child but still actively involved with his child and her child care arrangements.

Age and Educational Level of Spouses

The age distribution of the spouses was very similar to that of the respondents. Again, most were between twenty-five and forty years of age.

Table 4 - Age of Spouses

Age in Years	N	%
Total	34	99.9
25 - 29	8	23.5
30 - 34	12	35.3
35 - 39	9	26.5
40 - 44	2	5.9
45 - 49	1	2.9
50 - 54	1	2.9
55+	1	2.9

The educational level of the spouses appeared to be generally lower than that of the respondents.

Table 5 - Educational Level of Spouses

Level	N	%
Total	34	99.8
Completed public school	1	2.9
Some high school	5	14.7
Completed high school	8	23.5
Some university	3	8.8
Post-secondary, non-univ.	3	8.8
University, 1st degree	6	17.6
University, beyond 1st degree	8	23.5

Like the respondents, approximately 40% of the spouses had high school education or lower. However, more of these had not completed high school than was true for the respondents. Not as many spouses had completed university either, both for one degree or for more. Both male and female respondents had higher education than their spouses, however, it was more common in the case of male respondents.

Gross Family Income

Respondents were asked to estimate their gross family income.

Table 6 - Gross Family Income

Income	N	%
Total	40	100.0
$ 6,500 - $ 9,999	4	10.0
$10,000 - $13,999	5	12.5
$14,000 - $17,999	6	15.0
$18,000 - $21,999	3	7.5
$22,000 - $25,999	5	12.5
$26,000 - $29,999	4	10.0
$30,000 - $36,999	7	17.5
$37,000+	6	15.0

The range in incomes was very large, from approximately $6,500 per year to over $42,000. Generally, the respondents were well-off. Over half had gross family incomes above $22,000 per year; six were in the $37,000 and over category. Work position was a good indicator of what the respondent's gross family income would be. All nine respondents with gross family incomes of under $14,000 per year were in the secretarial/clerical category; only one of the 21 persons in this work category had a total family income as high as $26,000 per year. In contrast, not one of the persons in managerial/supervisory category had a total family income of under $26,000 per year.

All four respondents with gross family incomes of under $10,000 per year were women; three of them were single mothers. Other than these four, men and women were proportionally represented in the various gross family income categories.

Age and Number of Children

Most of the people in the study, thirty-one of the forty (77.5%) had only one child. Three of these were pregnant with a second child. Seven more (17.5%) already had two children. Both male and female respondents had more than one child.

There were fifty-one children in the sample; approximately 55% of them were pre-school age.

Table 7 - Age of Children

Age	N	%
Total	51	100.0
0 - 1	5	9.8
2 - 3	14	27.8
4 - 5	9	17.6
6 - 7	10	19.6
8 - 9	8	15.7
10 -11	5	9.8

Five, 9.8%, were under two years of age. There was no difference between the male and female respondents with regard to the age of their children.

Although the people in the managerial/supervisory category were not significantly older than those in the other two categories, their children were significantly older. Not one was under the age of four; most of their children were over eight years old. Respondents in both the other categories had young children.

CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS

Type of Arrangements

Nineteen of the fifty-one children in the study, 37.2% of the total, attended school full-time. Only six, 11.8%, attended school part-time. The rest, approximately half the children in the study, were in full-day child care arrangements while their parents were at work.

Lunch-time and After-school Care

Eighty-four percent of the school-aged children were under adult supervision both at lunch time and after school.

Table 8 - Lunch-Time Care for School-Aged Children

Arrangement	N	%
Total	19	99.9
At School	7	36.8
At other home with adult supervision	5	26.3
At own home with adult other than parent	4	21.0
At home with no supervision	2	10.5
At home with older children	1	5.3

Table 9 - After-School Care for School-Aged Children

Arrangement	N	%
Total	19	100.0
At other home with adult supervision	6	31.6
At own home with adult other than parent	6	31.6
At home with parent	4	21.0
At home with no supervision	2	10.5
At home with older child	1	5.3

The most common lunch-time arrangement, done in 37% or seven cases, was for the child to remain at school. Since none of the schools had after-school programs this was not an option for after-school care. Four of the seven children returned home to parents after school; the parents had sufficiently flexible schedules to allow themselves to be at home when school let out. In the other three cases, arrangements were made with other adults for after-school supervision. At lunch-time, the majority of arrangements took place outside of the home. The opposite was true after school.

Three children were not under adult supervision: one was supervised by his fifteen-year-old sister, the other two were totally unsupervised.

Part-Day Arrangements

Six children, 11.8% of the total, needed part-day arrangements because the kindergarten or nursery school they were attending only ran for one half-day. Three of these spent the other half-day in nursery school, one in a day-care centre, and two with private babysitters.

Full-Day Arrangements

Twenty-six children, approximately half the total, were in full-day arrangements. Only eight, approximately 30% of them, were in daycare centres. The other eighteen were cared for in private arrangements: half of them in their own homes, the other half in the babysitters' homes. Both relatives and non-relatives acted as babysitters.

Cost of Child Care

The range in child care expenses was large. Some respondents paid nothing for their arrangements; others paid in excess of $60 per week per child. Costs for part-time arrangements did not differ greatly from full-time.

Table 10 - Weekly Cost for Child Care (per child) By Yearly Gross Family Income

Weekly Cost (per child)	Yearly Gross Family Income				Total	
	Under $14,000		$14,000 &Over			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
$0	0	0.0	7	22.6	7	17.5
$1 - $9	1	11.1	0	0.0	1	2.5
$10- $19	1	11.1	3	9.7	4	10.0
$20- $29	2	22.2	5	16.1	7	17.5
$30- $39	3	33.3	8	25.8	11	27.5
$40- $49	1	11.1	2	6.5	3	7.5
$50- $59	0	0.0	1	3.2	1	2.5
$60+	0	0.0	2	6.5	2	5.0
Can't Estimate	1	11.1	3	9.7	4	10.0
TOTAL	9	99.9	31	100.1	40	100.0

The people with free child care were not those with the lowest incomes. None of those with free child care had gross family incomes under $14,000 per year. Respondents with higher gross family incomes had much greater variability in their costs for child care. Many of them had free child care; they were also the only ones paying in excess of $50 per week per child. Those with gross family incomes under $14,000 per year had a smaller range of costs. Only one of these persons was subsidized for child care expenses.

EFFECT OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS ON STAFF PRODUCTIVITY AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

The section "Development of Research Design and Schedule" mentions the difficulties that were encountered in creating valid measures of staff productivity. It was necessary to create measures for this study with little assistance from the literature on the topic.

Problems with child care arrangements can negatively affect productivity both directly and indirectly. The direct means are primarily through employee absenteeism due to child care reasons. Indirectly, problems can influence productivity through a depressing effect on employee morale. These child care arrangements are made so that both parents can work; if there are problems with the arrangements, it is not unreasonable to suppose that these worries might affect the employee's work performance. The question of the effect of child care arrangements on career opportunities overlaps that of their effect on productivity. In fact, the inability of workers to take advantage of career opportunities can be viewed as another example of the indirect effects child care arrangements have on employee productivity.

Responsibility for Transportation

When investigating the effect of child care arrangements on work performance and career opportunities, it is important to note who is responsible for taking the child to and from child care arrangements. If it is the respondent, his or her ability to work overtime or travel is likely to be affected. Even if it is not the respondent, he or she could be affected. This was well shown by the respondent who worried that her child might get hit by a car while travelling alone to the child care arrangement.

Thirty-five percent of the people in the sample, both males and females, were responsible for transporting their children either to or from child care arrangements. Half were responsible for both journeys, half for one only; again there was no differentiation on the basis of sex.

For 22% of the children the question of transportation to arrangements was not applicable. This included nine children cared for at home and two where there were no arrangements. Thirty-one percent were responsible for transporting themselves; these were school-aged children walking from school to their arrangements.

The question of travelling home from the child care arrangements was not applicable for twenty-four of the fifty-one children (47%). These children were already at home. Nine children (18%) were taken home by the respondents; three (6%) by respondents and their spouses together. Nine more were taken home by the spouses alone and the other six either got home on their own or were transported by other individuals.

Information on travelling time was only collected if the respondent or spouse was directly involved. In a study on child care, it is difficult to consider respondents separately from their position as part of a family unit. It was felt, for this reason, that information should be collected about the effect of child care arrangements on spouses as well as on respondents, particularly in an area such as the amount of time spent travelling each day in order to allow both parents to work. Approximately half the children were taken to or from arrangements by their parents; 20 respondents or their spouses were so involved. In most cases, the distance between home and arrangement was quite short, travelling time was under fifteen minutes for twenty-one of the twenty-five children. For the other four children, it took the parents longer, between thirty minutes and one hour. Several respondents were directly responsible for this longer journey. The most common means of transportation was walking, fifteen of the twenty-five children were taken to arrangements by foot. Nine were driven by car; one was taken by public transit. Travelling time to work was longer since many arrangements were nearby home. In eight of the twenty cases it took between thirty minutes and one hour to get between the arrangement and work. In six others it took between fifteen minutes and twenty-nine minutes. Three found it took them over one hour; three found it a short journey of less than fifteen minutes. Public transit was most commonly used; in thirteen of the twenty cases this was the means. In four a car was used and in three cases a combination of public transit and cars were used.

Only two respondents, five percent of the sample, felt that their present child care arrangements were inconvenient,[3] although others had experienced difficulty in the past.

[3]One woman had driven 10 miles from Etobicoke to Scarborough twice daily in order to obtain summer care; one male respondent was presently driving many miles in the opposite direction from work in order to reach his child's day care centre.

Flexibility of Hours of Arrangements

Over one-third of the people in the sample were responsible for transporting their children to or from child care arrangements. Ten respondents, 25% of the sample, felt that the hours of operation of their child care arrangements limited the hours they could work. Several others said that their hours would not be limited as long as they were given notice for the overtime so that arrangements could be made with their baby-sitters.

Table 11 - Whether Child Care Arrangements Limit Work Hours of Either Respondent or Spouse

	Limit Work Hours	N	%
Total		40	100.0
	Self	5	12.5
	Spouse	4	10.0
	Both	5	12.5
	Neither	26	65.0

The 25% who said that their child care arrangements limited their work hours were largely but not exclusively those responsible for taking children to or from arrangements. Obviously, for some respondents, factors other than this made them feel that the arrangements limited their work hours, therefore no conclusions should be drawn in this regard.

Overtime Work

Nearly three-quarters of the people (29 respondents) felt that their jobs involved overtime work. While all but one felt that this occurred only on occasion, not frequently, many noted that their overtime work was seasonal, occurring with great frequency during certain times and almost never during others. Eleven respondents,(27.5%), said their jobs did not involve overtime work. There was no difference between the male and female respondents with regard to their jobs involving overtime work.

Table 12 - Whether Respondent Turned Down or Did Not Work Overtime Because of Child Care Arrangements

	Effect on Overtime	N	%
Total		40	100.0
	No overtime at job	11	27.5
(i)	Turned down supervisor's request	5	12.5
(ii)	Just left work 'til next day	3	7.5
	Both (i) and (2)	2	5.0
	Neither(i) nor (ii)	17	42.5
	Other	2	5.0

Overtime occurred both with and without advance notice, affecting both those who felt their child care arrangements limited their work hours and those who felt overtime could be accommodated if notice was given. Of the twenty-nine respondents who felt that their jobs involved overtime work, 35% of them or 10 said that they had either turned down and/or just not worked overtime when they could have due to their child care arrangements. Two others had worked out a compromise; they took their overtime work home if necessary. Both men and women turned down overtime work for this reason equally, so did respondents from the three different work categories: managerial/supervisory, professional/technical and secretarial/clerical. Again, no question was asked concerning their feelings about having turned down overtime, therefore no conclusions should be drawn about this.

Job Opportunities

One aspect of worker productivity the study wanted to investigate was the effect of child care arrangements on the career opportunities of employees with children. For this reason, each respondent was asked whether or not they had ever turned down or just not applied for another job because of their child care arrangements. This included both lateral and vertical changes. Seven respondents stated that they had not applied for other jobs because of their child care arrangements; an additional respondent stated that she had actually turned down a job offer for this reason although she did not say so in her refusal. Several spoke of the importance of having a supervisor sympathetic to the problems of a working parent; they were not willing to chance losing this by taking another job. Others were afraid that a new job might involve more overtime work or a loss of the flexible hours their jobs now contained. Fully twenty percent of the respondents were unwilling to leave their present jobs because of their child care arrangements. This group included both men and women though women appeared to do so more often.

Travelling

Questions on travelling were included on the assumption that in some branches respondents who were either unwilling or unable to travel might find their career opportunities limited.[4] Thirty-nine percent of those asked,(13 respondents), stated that their jobs involved travelling. Five of these,(39%), said that they had either repeatedly or occasionally refused to travel because of their child care arrangements. Three of the five, both men and women, felt that this action had negatively affected their career opportunities. At least one of these was a single mother who had to be home evenings and nights to care for her child; at the same time, this person was unwilling to change jobs to an area where travelling was less important for career advancement because her supervisor was sympathetic to the problems of single parents and allowed her the flexibility necessary in such a situation.

[4] This group of questions on travelling (41A,B,C) was not added until the eighth interview took place.

Training and Development

Each respondent was asked whether or not they had taken any course since working for the Civil Service. Eighty-three percent of the people had done so; twenty-one percent of them, both men and women felt that their child care arrangements had interfered with this effort. They spoke of the numerous difficulties involved in taking evening, weekend and out-of-town courses. One common problem was arranging extra child care services. One respondent had to quit a course because her evening arrangements were not dependable; on several occasions the sitter just did not show up and she was forced to hurry home, missing classes. In two cases, spouses were greatly inconvenienced if the respondents took courses. For example, one spouse had to stay home from her evening job unless her husband was home to stay with their child. Respondents also mentioned the increased costs of child care if babysitters were used. Out-of-town courses presented even greater problems. For example, one respondent was unable to take an out-of-town course he wanted because his wife could not assume responsibility for taking their child to child care arrangements. Single mothers found it very difficult to leave town because of the problem of evening and overnight care. Several others spoke of exhaustion after a day of work and courses and the impossibility of spending enough time with their children under these conditions.

It has been noted that 21% of the persons who had taken courses found their child care arrangmeents interfered with this effort. An additional 18% said there was no problem because they had taken their courses prior to the birth of their children. Of the 61% who felt that their arrangements had not interfered with their ability to take courses, many credited this to the fact that their courses were held during work hours, either over lunch or during the actual work day. Several commented that these were the only conditions under which they could take courses. In addition, one of the seven, who had not taken courses, stated that her child arrangments were the determining factor in her decision not to do so; she had to be home to take care of her child in the evenings. The conflict between child care arrangements and courses appeared to be a fairly widespread problem, one that was greatly alleviated by daytime courses.

Absenteeism Due to Children's Illnesses

Each respondent was asked whether, over the past six months, they or their spouses had taken time off work due to their children's illnesses. In 70% of the cases, either one or both of them had done so. Seventeen respondents, 42.5% of the total, had taken time off work. Women were significantly more likely to have done so than were men. Most took no more than three days although one respondent had to stay home for a total of two weeks. One respondent could not remember the number of days she had missed but knew she had done so.

Table 14 - Number of Days Respondents Took Off Work Due to Children's Illnesses

Number of Days	N
Total	16
1 day	5
1½ days	1
2 days	4
2½ days	2
3 days	2
3½ days	0
4 days	1
10 days	1

It appears that respondents in the managerial/supervisory category took less time off work for children's illnesses than did the others. This is probably due to the fact that their children were significantly older than those of the respondents in the professional/technical and secretarial/clerical categories. Age of children is a critical factor in determining the frequency with which children get ill and whether or not the parents should be with them when this occurs.

Slightly over one-half of the spouses had taken time off work due to their children's illnesses. There was no relationship between whether a respondent took time off work and whether the spouse did. In 25% of the cases, both the respondent and spouse took time off work, in 18% only the respondent did and in 27% of the cases only the spouse stayed home for this reason. Although men, both respondents and spouses, did take time off work for this reason, they generally did not take off as many days as did the women.

Absenteeism Due to a Breakdown in Child Care Arrangements

Only 27.5% of the respondents said that they had taken time off work during the past six months because of a breakdown in child care arrangements. None of these absences were for more than two days; 17.5% took one day, the other 10% took two. Both men and women did so; women were no more likely to lose time off work for this reason than were men. Yet, when children were ill, women were the main ones to stay home.

Only in 5% of the cases did spouses take time off work because child care arrangements had broken down.

Summary of Absenteeism Either Due to Children's Illnesses or a Breakdown in Child Care Arrangements

The people in the sample missed over 55 work days during the past six months for child care reasons: 40 days due to children's illnesses and 15 days for breakdowns in child care arrangements. When projected to the 141 T.E.I.A. employees in the Toronto area who made up the population for this study,

T.E.I.A. lost 192 work days in the past six months due to child care reasons. One hundred and thirty-nine of these were due to children's illnesses; fifty-three were for breakdowns in arrangements.

The issue of taking time off work was not just one of how many work days the Ministry lost. For many respondents, taking time off work placed them under heavy strain. Male respondents in particular voiced nagging fears that their jobs would be adversely affected by absences for child care reasons. One had to deal both with this concern and the fact that his wife's employer was totally unreasonable about child care absences. Whenever they had to take time off work, an upsetting situation resulted.

Another problem area was that of how absences for child care reasons were noted. Technically, sick leave cannot be used for this purpose.[5] Whether or not this was adhered to apparently depended upon what branch of T.E.I.A. the employees worked for. Where its application was strict, the employee either had to lie about the reason for the absence, take vacation leave, make the lost time up, or take the day off without pay. If the application was looser, employees could take sick leave if they so chose. If the employee was on contract, he or she was not usually covered by sick leave and therefore could not use sick leave for any purpose. Fifty-three percent of the respondents had taken time off work either because of children's illnesses or because of arrangements breaking down. Twenty-eight percent took it as sick leave; five percent took a combination of sick leave and vacation leave. Of the rest, 7.5% took vacation leave, 5% made the lost time up, 5% lost no pay because it was only a few hours at a time, and 2.5% (1 person) lost the pay because of being on contract. The position of contract staff and the unevenness in application of sick leave benefits seem to be problem areas.

Changes in Arrangements: Permanent, Summer and Emergency

Thirty percent of the respondents, twelve persons of both sexes, had changed their child care arrangements over the past year. They were not asked whether or not these changes posed any difficulties.

Thirty percent of the respondents, not necessarily the same 12 persons as above, said that they had to make alternate child care arrangements for the summer. In half of the cases, they said that they had experienced some difficulty in doing so. Three of them had problems with getting someone for the entire summer since the summer season is a common vacation time. One of these had even more difficulty than the others because she wanted the sitter to come to her home to care for her two children; most sitters wanted the children brought to them. Another respondent had to travel twenty miles per day to her summer arrangements. The remaining two had other problems. Even once summer arrangements had been made, three of the six felt that the arrangements they had made were not working out.

[5] In May, 1975, the Ministry of Revenue issued instructions under Section 15(7), Regulation 749, Public Service Act, to allow working parents to use leave for special or compassionate purposes to take time off to care for a sick child.

Thirteen respondents, 32.5% of the sample, stated that they had encountered difficulty in making emergency or temporary child care arrangements for their children. These were not necessarily the same ones that answered affirmatively in the other two questions. People with more than one child either had trouble making arrangements for both or neither. Income did not matter; respondents with larger incomes had just as much difficulty in making emergency arrangements as did those with less money. The main difference was with regard to sex. Men were significantly more likely to say that there was difficulty in finding emergency or temporary child care arrangements than were the women. Perhaps men are less used to the problems involved in making child care arrangements than are women, since child care traditionally has been viewed as a woman's area. Obviously, making child care arrangements put some pressure on many of the respondents. This fact should not be considered on its own but rather in conjunction with the other information contained in these sections.

Concern About Arrangements

When asked if they ever worried about their child care arrangements, 30% of them, both male and female, said that they did. Worries fell in several general areas: worries about the adequacy of the arrangement, worries about its dependability, concern with the cost, concern about the problem of the child getting to the arrangement on his/her own, and guilt feelings about the mother not being home with the children.

There was concern about the physical aspects of care as well as the mental ones. Several respondents said that their mothers were ailing; in one case the grandmother had passed out several times while alone with the child. Another respondent said her child was not getting enough to eat at the arrangement, a problem she had spoken to the babysitter about. A fourth said her mother-in-law, unfamiliar with Canadian procedures, very possibly would not know what to do in case of emergency. Four other respondents were concerned about the quality of attention their children received, both from the point of mental stimulation and from that of the moral training they were receiving. Two respondents were concerned with the dependability of their arrangements and the effect that constantly changing arrangements might have on their children. Only one was greatly worried about cost; the day care centre administrators were presently talking about boosting their prices heftily. Two were worried about their school-aged children travelling to arrangements on their own, one because of the traffic on the streets the child had to cross, the other because of the problem of disreputable characters hanging about the schoolgrounds.

One woman said she had guilt feelings about not staying at home like a "proper parent". Several of the men commented on their feeling that the best thing for the children would probably be for the mother to stay home and take care of them. Their fear was that the substitute care was not as good.

Desired Changes in Arrangements

Each respondent was asked whether or not they would change their child care arrangements if there were no constraints at all. Thirteen, 32.5% of the sample,said they would do so. In some cases, these were the same respondents who said that they worried about their arrangements, but not necessarily. This is not surprising, since some of the things respondents worried about would not disappear even if their child care arrangements were changed.

Four respondents said that they would like to take their children from babysitters and put them either in daycare centres or in nursery schools. Three more talked about the lack of mental stimulation for their children in their present arrangements; one of them intimated that a daycare centre would be preferable, saying that she would prefer her child to be cared for among other children. The rest made varying suggestions including, in two cases, a switch to more convenient child care locations.

Family Budget Constraints

Six of the respondents, 15.0% of the sample, did not pay anything for their child care arrangements and therefore this question did not apply to them. Thirty percent of the sample, twelve persons, found their expenses a strain; the remaining fifty-five percent did not. Understandably, respondents with lower family incomes were more likely to find their costs a strain on their budget than were those with higher incomes. The distinction between those with lower and higher incomes also held true for their answers to the question of whether their costs were fair or reasonable. The higher the gross family income, the more likely they were to think that their costs were fair and the less likely they were to find them too high. There was no difference between male and female respondents with respect to these questions.

The important point is that 30% of the respondents found it a strain on their family budgets to pay for their child care expenses.

Family Relationships

Thirty-eight percent of the respondents, both male and female, felt that their child care arrangements had been the cause of pressures on their family relationships. It was difficult to summarize their comments because of their great variation, however certain common areas did emerge. One was the conflict between the feeling that a mother should stay home and take care of her children and the fact that these mothers were out working. Related to this was the conflict over whose responsibility it was to stay home if the children were ill. Another problem area had to do with having relatives

as babysitters. This included problems ranging from husbands continually criticizing their mother-in-laws to grandparents favouring the child they looked after over their other grandchildren. The last area was that of timing problems. For example, one of the respondents had to be home to babysit or else his wife could not attend her evening job. This problem, with various twists, was common to several respondents.

Arrangements for Illness of Child (One Day)

Respondents were asked what arrangements would be made if any of their children fell ill for one day. Thirty-eight percent, exclusively women, said that they would stay home with their child. Thirty-three percent, mostly men, said that either they or another person, usually their spouse, would remain home. From the figures on actual absences from work, it is apparent that most often it was the spouse that stayed home. Men were less inclined to stay home for children's illnesses than their responses might indicate. Therefore, although approximately 70% of the sample gave responses that would possibly involve their taking time off work, in reality this figure is probably an exaggeration. Of the remaining 30%, 22.5% said that a member of their immediate family would care for the child, 7.5% said that another person would do so. Fifty-five percent of the respondents (22 persons) were satisfied with their proposed arrangements; 37.5% (15 persons) were not. The remaining 7.5% were undecided. People who suggested arrangements that would possibly involve taking time off work were no less pleased with this proposal than were those who suggested another possibility.

Arrangements for Illness of Child (One to Two Weeks)

Respondents were asked what arrangements they would make if one of their children fell ill for one to two weeks. Examples used were measles or chicken pox. Twenty-eight percent, all women, stated that they would stay home in such a case. An additional 7.5% qualified this statement, saying that they would only stay home while the child was very ill. Twenty-two percent, primarily men, said that either they or their spouses would remain at home. From the figures on actual absences, it is likely that the male respondents would indeed stay home for part of the time, but that their spouses would take proportionally more time off work. Thus although 57.5% of the respondents gave answers that would probably involve their taking time off work, not all of these would take the full one to two weeks themselves. The 57.5% was lower than the 70% who so indicated in the previous section. For the remaining 42.5% of the respondents, 20.0% said that a member of their immediate family would take on the responsibility of staying home with the child, 12.5% said another person would do so, and 10.0% had other responses including "I just can't think about that ".

Respondents generally were less satisfied with these proposed arrangements than they were with those in the previous section. This is probably because the previous section asked about changes for one day only, while this section involved plans for several weeks. Several respondents of both sexes

qualified their statements by saying that it would be good for the child if they stayed home even though it was unsatisfactory for them. Men were significantly more dissatisfied with their proposed arrangements than were the women. Since respondents were not asked why they found their proposed arrangements either satisfactory or not, the reason for this difference is not known.

Table 13- Satisfaction with Proposed Arrangements for Lengthy Illness by Sex of Respondent

How Satisfactory	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Unsatisfactory	11	91.7	7	25.9	18	46.2
Undecided	0	0.0	4	14.8	4	10.3
Satisfactory	1	8.3	16	59.3	17	43.6
Total	12	100.0	27	100.0	39	100.1

Seventeen respondents, 42.5%, were satisfied with their proposed arrangements, eighteen were not. Four more were undecided and one could not say because she did not know what arrangements she would possible make.

Plans for Breakdown of Arrangements (One day)

Respondents were asked what plans would be made if their child care arrangements were unavailable for one day. Thirty-eight percent (15 respondents), almost all women, stated that they would stay at home. An additional 22.5%, mostly men, said that either they or their spouses would stay home. The actual data on absences due to arrangements breaking down showed that men were in fact just as likely to take time off work for this reason as were women. Therefore, in total, 60% of the respondents suggested arrangements that would quite possibly involve their taking time off work. Only four persons, 10%, said that a member of their immediate family would stay with the child for the day, 12.5% less than suggested it if their child was ill. Seven respondents, 17.5%, stated that another person would care for their child for the one day. Two did not have arrangements that could possibly break down and the remaining three persons proposed either having no arrangements for the day or having their older child babysit.

Sixty-three percent of the respondents were satisfied with their proposed arrangements. Thirty-three percent were dissatisfied. No one was undecided; the other two had arrangements that could not break down in this manner and therefore the question was inapplicable to them. There was a feeling that it was not necessary for the parent to remain home with the child for the day if the child was not ill. This was reflected in their satisfaction with their proposed arrangements. Every dissatisfied respondent had suggested plans that would potentially involve their taking time off work.

Men were more dissatisfied with this prospect than were women, but women were not generally pleased either.

Arrangements if Child Care Services End

Each respondent was asked what they would do if their child care arrangements ended, until such time as other stable arrangements could be made. Only 15% said they would stay home until new arrangements were made; all of these persons were female. Thirty-three percent said that they would depend on either a close family member (5 respondents) or another person (8 respondents). Eleven of these thirteen were women. The men, on the other hand, were more likely to say that they would try to get someone else; their answers were less definite than were the women's. Two men said that their wives might have to quit work under such conditions. This solution was quite satisfactory to both men. Two women also suggested this possibility for themselves, not their spouses. Neither were very satisfied with this idea; one said it would definitely be unsatisfactory, the other was undecided.

Only 30% of the respondents (12 persons) were satisfied with their proposed arrangements in this case. All of these knew other persons who could care for their children in such a situation. Forty-seven percent of the respondents were dissatisfied; 12.5% were undecided. The remaining 10% felt that, given their present arrangements, this situation could not occur. Women were considerably more unhappy with their suggestions in this section than in any other. The dissatisfied respondents, both male and female, were most often those making suggestions that would possibly involve their taking time off work for this reason.

Summary of Sections on Arrangements for Illness of Child and Plans for Breakdown of Arrangements

Several ideas surfaced in these sections. One was that a sick child is best tended by its parents, preferably by the mother. Another was that a one-day absence from work is not as troubling as missing longer periods of time. These two came directly into conflict in the question about the one to two week illness, as was apparent in the interviews. Seventy percent of the sample made suggestions involving the possibility of their taking time off work if their child was ill for one day. This dropped down ten percent when the time span increased to one to two weeks. The final situation of indeterminate time length was the most difficult for the respondents to deal with. Only a small number suggested their staying at home during this period. This was also the section where the respondents were least satisfied with their answers, for in many cases it involved imposing on close relatives or neighbours for an indeterminate period of time.

Location of Child Care Arrangements

Respondents were asked where they would prefer their child care arrangements. Fifteen, 37.5% of the sample, said that they would prefer child care arrangements near home. An additional 22.5% or nine of the respondents stated that they would most prefer child care arrangements in their homes. Three more stated a preference for child care close to both the home and the school and three more wanted arrangements near the local school. By implication, 70% of the sample preferred arrangements closer to home than to work. Several respondents commented that the age of the child was a critical factor with respect to this question. They felt that care near work would be suitable for pre-school-aged children but not for school-aged children. Other respondents further qualified this, saying that they would not want to take infants to work with them but would not mind doing so for toddlers. Four respondents (10.5%) gave their preferred arrangements as those near their work; three more wanted something on the way to work. Of the remaining three, two had no preference and one wanted child care arrangements on the way to his spouse's work. All respondents with more than one child wanted the same location for each of their children.

The question about a daycare facility at Queen's Park was added to the interview form after nine interviews in response to the questions many respondents had on this topic. All but nine respondents were asked whether they supported the concept of daycare facilities at Queen's Park and whether they would use it if one were available. Twenty-six of the thirty-one respondents, 84% of them, said they supported the idea in principle. Twelve of these said they would use it if available. Many of these did not have children under two years old; often their children were between two years old and five years.

III. ADDITIONAL INTERVIEWS

Interviews with Managers

An attempt was made to interview nine managerial staff in order to find out whether they knew of any conflicts between job and child care responsibilities experienced by their employees. These nine persons, ranging from managers to executive directors, were chosen by the Women's Coordinator to cover a cross-section of the Ministry, representing different divisions. They were not picked by random selection. It was only possible to interview four of the nine, two by telephone and two in person. The rest were on holidays when the attempt was made and time was too limited to allow a follow-up. One other manager was interviewed, a respondent from a regional office who addressed the problem from the standpoint of a manager at the end of his interview.

There was no formal interview schedule, but most managers were asked similar questions. An example of these is included in Appendix E. The most striking feature about the interviews was not the answers to the questions but the attitudes

displayed toward the topic. Some managers were most supportive, others definitely were not. One man denied firmly that there were any problems in this area with his employees, ending with the comment, "I haven't given the area of child care much thought". The others were not as ready to deny the existence of possible problems. In one extreme case, a woman had to quit her job in the branch because it was felt that the conflict between her child care responsibilities and her job could only be accommodated through permanent part-time work. This arrangement would have been unacceptable to the branch. In most cases, managers were not aware of any real problems. One executive director speculated that employees do not come to them with these problems because they do not feel that child care is the employers' responsibility and they fear the effect on their jobs of using child care as an excuse. As such, child care problems tend to go by unnoticed unless the problems build up to a crisis point.

Only two of the managers were asked their feelings with regard to a day care facility at Queen's Park. Both supported the idea in principle so long as the operational costs were covered by the fees and there was no question of subsidization.

Interviews with Regional Offices

Thirteen of the 155 people with children under 12 years old worked in regional offices in London, Thunder Bay, Sudbury, Ottawa, and Central Ontario. It was decided not to include them in the main study since any difference between the regions and Toronto would have been masked by their small numbers. Instead, they were separated out and all thirteen were contacted. Only five were actually interviewed. Eight of the thirteen, 61.5%, had wives at home with the children. The other three men had working wives and were interviewed. Of the three women, only two were interviewed; the other was on holidays for the entire month.

Since there were only five respondents, no real comparison could be made between them and the Toronto respondents. However, some general comments can be made. Four of the five respondents had in-home arrangements; this seemed to be a fairly high proportion. Their children also appeared to be older than those of the respondents in Toronto; four of the five had school-aged children. The fifth had two school-aged children and one three-year-old. The regions were not without their child care problems either. Only one respondent had no problems whatsoever. Difficulties in making emergency arrangements and in taking courses were among the problems mentioned. One respondent volunteered the information that his child care problems, even though not solved, were much less troublesome in Thunder Bay than they had been in Toronto. However, it definitely could not be said that the information from these five respondents backed up this statement.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The terms of reference for the study were to determine to what degree the daycare arrangements of T.E.I.A. employees affect staff productivity, turnover, and loss and whether daycare arrangements allow employees to take advantage of career opportunities. A further aspect was to explore to what degree and in what manner employee productivity would be enhanced by expansion or improvement of their daycare arrangements.

Given the limitations on data and resources to conduct the study, the conclusions do not address the entire terms of reference. Instead, it was decided to focus on the areas of productivity and career opportunities. Information on turnover and loss was not gathered; however, it is important to note that according to the Personnel Branch, everyone who has taken maternity leave in 1975 and 1976 has returned to Ministry employment, indicating at least a degree of resolution of child care responsibilities.

From the data in this study, it can be concluded that there are areas of conflict between work responsibilities and those responsibilities undertaken in rearing children and that both productivity and career opportunities are adversely affected by this conflict in many respects.

Relationship to Productivity

The two major effects on productivity noted were absenteeism and distraction due to concern for sick children or inadequate arrangements (see Table 1 - Factors Affecting Productivity and Career Opportunities). The first can be measured in concrete terms by number of days taken off when normal child care arrangements were unsatisfactory. In a six-month period, almost half the respondents took time off due to children's illnesses and just under one-third took time off due to breakdowns in arrangements. This resulted in an actual loss of 55 workdays during the six-month period for the 40 employees involved. When projected to the total Ministry population for one year, the loss to TEIA would be 384 work days for emergency child care reasons, an average of 2.7 days per person.

The specific degree to which these working parents were distracted or lacked concentration while on the job, due to inadequate child care and related reasons, is difficult to determine. However, certain findings indicate that more than a third of working parents are subject to substantial pressures and strains that must inevitably take their toll during working hours, in one form or another, such as phone call interruptions or lack of concentration. A third encountered difficulties in making emergency arrangements, a third worried about the adequacy of their regular arrangements, a third found the financial burden of child care a worry, and a third felt that their arrangements caused strains on the relationship with their spouse.

The study indicates, therefore, that problems related to child care, particularly the need for emergency arrangements, do have a significant effect on employee productivity.

TABLE 1

FACTORS AFFECTING PRODUCTIVITY
AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

FACTOR	% OF RESPONDENTS AFFECTED	DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS
1. Absenteeism due to		
a) child's illness	43	F away more than M
b) breakdown in arrangements	28	None (for (a) and (b), M more worried about absenteeism affecting their careers than F.)
2. Travel on job required	39 (39% of these had turned down requests to travel with negative consequences)	none
3. Strain on family relationships	38	none
4. Responsibility for child's transportation	35	none
5. Job overtime requested	30 (turned down supervisor's request or not worked)	none
6. Strain on family budget	30	none (except for single mothers)
7. Worried about present arrangements	30	none (except that for F and M the potential solution was F stay at home)
8. Had to change arrangements		
a) permanent	30	M had more difficulty than F in finding new arrangements
b) summer	30 (half unsatisfactory)	
c) emergency	33 (had difficulty)	
9. Limitation on work hours due to child care arrangement	25	none
10. Work-related courses (had difficulty taking)	21 (83% took courses)	more difficult for F, especially out of town and evening courses
11. New job (turned down or not apply due to child care)	20	more often for F

Relationship to Career Opportunities

Concerns related to child care arrangements did interfere with working parents' ability to take advantage of career opportunities in several respects, primarily in moving to other jobs and taking job-related courses. Almost a quarter of the respondents were unwilling to leave their present jobs because of child-care restrictions. Some had a supervisor who was sympathetic to their needs as working parents; for example, to pick their child up at a daycare centre by a certain time. They were reluctant to jeopardize this by moving to an unknown setting. Others were afraid that a new job would require more overtime work than their present job did or that they would forfeit the flex hours they now worked which complemented their child care arrangements.

The large majority had taken work-related courses[6]; a quarter of them felt that their arrangements interfered with these efforts. Additional child-care arrangements were often necessary, particularly if the courses were not during regular work hours or were out of town. Difficulties encountered were in finding dependable arrangements, incurring extra costs, and were particularly severe for single mothers attending out-of-town courses.

Other significant factors affecting career development were largely those which constrained the employee's ability to work overtime or according to a schedule which did not fit with his/her child care arrangements. A small proportion had had negative consequences on the job as a result of turning down a request to travel.

Differential in Effects on Men and Women Employees.

According to this study (see Table 1), there are few apparent differences between men and women in the effects of combining the roles of employee and parent. This is due, in a large part, to the common unifying factor among the respondents - all had at least some degree of responsibility in making or maintaining arrangements for their child(ren).

Where women are more disadvantaged, it is in significant areas - taking new jobs, training courses, and absenteeism for sick child - although the degree of differentiation is not great in all cases. The only area where men seem more disadvantaged is in finding new arrangements in case of breakdown.

[6] 83% of these working parents had taken work-related courses, a much higher proportion than the Ministry-wide one.

Managers' Attitudes and Regional Offices

Due to the small sample, no conclusions will be drawn on managers' attitudes or comparing the situations of Queen's Park versus regional office employees. However, the wide variation in attitudes expressed by the managers interviewed, including their awareness of and support for employees with daycare problems, complements the concerns expressed by respondents regarding the need for a sympathetic supervisor and flexibility, at times, in work arrangements when they conflict with child care responsibilities.

Summary

The problems encountered by working parents are widely varied. Some the Ministry can take steps to alleviate, others are totally out of the Ministry's control. Action by the Ministry to alleviate some of the problems would aid parents in taking advantage of career opportunities if they so desire.

One area where the conflict could be greatly alleviated is with respect to courses. Daytime weekday courses were a great benefit to those wishing to maintain or up-grade their skills. Efforts could be made to encourage the government and various educational institutions to offer daytime courses for government staff and expand their offerings. The use of lunchtime and the period of time immediately after work should be encouraged so that large amounts of work time would not be lost for staff development purposes.

The uneven application of policy to cover child care emergencies was another problem area. A Ministry-wide policy, if not a government-wide policy, would be fairer in this regard. It would also be desirable if contract employees could be treated similarly.

Another point that emerged from the study was the lack of after-school programs for school-aged children. At-school arrangements were the most frequently used lunchtime arrangement; after school nothing was available. One school did not even allow children to stay there at lunchtime. One parent strongly voiced his support for after-school programs; it is probable that others would use them were they available.

While emergency child care needs posed a problem for employees, many respondents appeared unaware of the various agencies that will provide immediate care for children on a temporary basis.

APPENDIX A

T.E.I.A. DAYCARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Nancy Bardecki, Economist	Tax & Fiscal Policy
Glenna Carr, Women's Coordinator	
Gardiner Church, Manager	Local Government Organization
Jan De Poe, Statistician	Central Statistical Services
Michele Fordyce, Senior Advisor	Intergovernmental Affairs
Ruth Ross, Summer Student	Office of Women's Coordinator

May, 1976

APPENDIX B Preliminary Survey through Women's Advisory Committee

Ontario

Ministry of Treasury
Economics and
Intergovernmental
Affairs

Queen's Park
Toronto Ontario

May 31, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: WAC Members, Alternates and Regional Office Representatives

SUBJECT: TEIA Daycare Project

At the May 11th meeting of the Women's Advisory Committee we discussed the daycare project that will be carried out by Ruth Ross, a graduate student working with my office for the summer. The terms of reference for the study, which were approved by the Deputy Minister, are attached for your information.

Ruth will be working with a Ministry Advisory Committee including Nancy Bardecki, (Tax & Fiscal Policy), Jan De Poe (formerly of the Queen's Park Daycare Committee), Gardiner Church (Local Government Organization), Michele Fordyce (Intergovernmental Affairs) and myself.

Since there are no Ministry records on which employees have children, we would like to enlist your aid in surveying the staff of the branch or office indicated on the attached form to determine who has children and what their ages are. Please note we are asking you to survey all employees, male and female, regular and contract staff. From the preliminary information you provide, Ruth will select a sample and conduct in-depth interviews in person.

If you have any questions or encounter any difficulties, please call me. Directors will be notified that this survey is taking place.

Please return the questionnaires by June 11th.

Glenna Carr

Glenna Carr
Women's Coordinator

Attach. 2

DAYCARE PROJECT

Terms of Reference

"A study to determine to what degree the daycare arrangements of TEIA employees affect staff productivity, turnover, and loss; whether daycare arrangements allow employees to take advantage of career opportunities; to what degree and in what manner would their productivity (Ministry and Government productivity) be enhanced by expansion or improvement of their daycare arrangements."

- Ministry Affirmative Action Plan, September 1975 - March 1977 (III.G.2 Daycare Arrangements).

Objective

To prepare a report outlining the results of the above study and recommending an appropriate plan of action for the Ministry of TEIA.

Approach

Summer student to undertake study and prepare report. Student to report to the Women's Coordinator and to work with a project advisory team of Ministry employees.

Activities

1. Analysis of TEIA Information Survey - section on daycare.

2. Statistical report on employees with children (e.g. number, sex, age, classification/salary, spouse, daycare arrangements, etc.)

3. Interviews with selected TEIA employees to determine (i) effects on productivity, and career opportunities, and (ii) what and how improved arrangements would help.

4. Interviews with selected managers to discuss effects on productivity, turnover, loss and career motivation.

Requirements

1. Determine which employees have young children - through WAC members with cooperation of staff.

2. Determine obvious loss or turnover due to maternity leave, daycare problems, through Personnel and Government Daycare Counsellor.

3. Establish how to measure effects on productivity and career opportunities - agreement of managers.

4. Develop appropriate action plan based on study results - with advisory Ministry team.

Time Frame

May 31 - August 21, 1976

TEIA DAYCARE PROJECT

BRANCH: _____ WAC Member: _____

or
OFFICE: _____

Ask all employees (regular and contract, male and female): Do you have children? If "yes", then give name of employee and ages of children.

Name of Employee	Office Telephone	Age of each child

Please return to the office of the Women's Coordinator
#501 Frost Bldg. South

ACCOUNTING DESIGN

Child Care Arrangements

Independent Variables

-cost of child care per child (Q15)

-flexibility of care hours, (evenings, nights, weekends) (Q13)

-convenience (length of time travelling to care (adequacy of trans. facilities, etc.) (Q6 to 12 & Q14)

-dependability (Q19)

-what arrangements made if child gets sick (minor, major) (Q21, Q23)

-what arrangements made if care giver gets sick? Or quits? (Q25, Q27)

-what child care arrangements are made (Q3, Q4)

-ease of making arrangements (Q20, Q22)

-satisfaction with arrangements (Q37)

General Information

Intervening Variables

-sex of respondent (Q39)

-age of respondent & spouse/partner (Q42, Q43)

-number of children (Q1)

-age of children (Q1)

-1 parent or 2 parent family (Q2)

-gross family income (Q16)

-employment status of mother (Q40,Q41)

-educational background of respondent & spouse (Q44, Q45)

Effect on Productivity & Career Opportunities

Dependent Variables

-satisfaction with cost (Q17, Q18)

-number of absences from work due to children's illnesses (Q32)

-has respondent had to refuse overtime because of childcare arrangements (Q39, Q40)

-absences from work due to child care arrangements breaking down (Q 34)

-worry about adequacy of arrangements (Q38)

-inability to take courses because of child care arrangements (Q36, Q37)

-promotion (Q41)

-travel (Q41A, Q41B, Q41C)

APPENDIX D

Interview Format & Coding Instructions

Child is a person 15 years old or younger.

Adult is a person 16 years old or older.

Q1. In the case of pregnancies, mark age of children as the number of months until the expected date of delivery, with a minus sign in front, i.e. -1, -2

Q3. If more than one child in this grouping, mark down separate answers for each.

Q4. School, nursery school and daycare are to be noted in descending order. If a child spends part of its day in one of these and the other part in another, then the child care arrangement should be counted as the lower one of the two, i.e. if child in nursery school for part-day and daycare for the other part, child care arrangement would be noted as "8. other (specify) daycare centre".

Q24. Immediate family includes relatives not living with respondent, i.e. parents, siblings. Would also include any other close relatives, this term being defined by the respondent.

Q26. Illnesses the seriousness of measles or chicken pox are being considered in this question.

Q32. Doctors appointments should be included.

Q35. If a combination of sick leave and vacation leave, circle "3. other" and specify.

Q40. "Just not worked it" means not working overtime when it was necessary, even though the respondent wasn't actually asked to do so.

Q42. If courses taken before child born, mark "0 Not applicable" in the "if yes" question.

Q49, Q50. "Completed high school" includes both grade 12 and grade 13 diplomas. "Graduate degree work or degree" includes professional training i.e. law, medicine, chartered accountancy.

T.E.I.A. Child Care Study Questionnaire

INTRODUCTION

Thank you very much for agreeing to take part in the study. Before we start, I'd like to make something clear. Your answers to these questions will remain strictly confidential. Your name will not be on the form and none of this information will be given to your supervisor or manager.
(If respondent asks: This study is of the child care arrangements of T.E.I.A. employees and how satisfactory these arrangements are to them.)

See Coding Instructions before using questionnaire.

1. Would you please tell me the ages of each of your children under 12 years old. Please include any current pregnancies.

   Ages
   (Oldest to youngest.)

   1.
   2.
   3.

   If respondent has a school-aged child, say "We're interested in the child care arrangements made during the school year, not the special ones made over the summer".

2. Is your family a one-parent or a two-parent family?

   1. two parent
   2. single mother
   3. single father

3. For your children under 12 years, attending school full time, where do they spend lunch time and after school?

   0. not applicable
   1. at school
   2. at your home with parent
   3. at your home with adult other than parent
   4. at your home with older child — lunchtime_____
   5. at your home with no supervision
   6. at other home with adult supervision — After school_____
   7. at other home with older child
   8. at other home with no supervision
   9. other (specify) _____

      _____

4. For your children under 12 years old attending school, nursery school, or daycare part-time, where do they spend the remainder of the day until one of the parents gets home?

0. not applicable
1. at your home with parent
2. at your home with adult other than parent
3. at your home with older child
4. at your home with no supervision
5. at other home with adult supervision
6. at other home with older child
7. at other home with no supervision
8. other (specify) _____

_____

5. For your other children under 12 years, what are their child care arrangements?

0. not applicable
1. at your home with adult other than parent
2. at your home with no supervision
3. at other home with adult supervision
4. at daycare centre full-time
5. other (specify) _____

_____

6. Who is primarily responsible for taking the child(ren) to the child care arrangements?

0. not applicable
1. yourself
2. spouse
3. both yourself and spouse
4. child (self)
5. other (specify) _____

_____

Child 1 _____
Child 2 _____
Child 3 _____

7. Who is primarily responsible for taking the child(ren) home from the child care arrangements?

0. not applicable
1. yourself
2. spouse
3. both yourself and spouse
4. child (self)
5. other (specify) _____

_____

Child 1 _____
Child 2 _____
Child 3 _____

8. How long does it take to get to the child care arrangement from your home?

0. not applicable
1. under 15 minutes
2. 15 - 29 minutes
3. 30 minutes - 1 hour
4. over 1 hour

Child 1 _____
Child 2 _____
Child 3 _____

9. How is this travelling done?

0. not applicable
1. car
2. public transit
3. walk
4. other (specify) _____

Child 1 _____
Child 2 _____
Child 3 _____

_____

10. How long does it take to get to work from your child care arrangements?

0. not applicable
1. under 15 minutes
2. 15 minutes - 29 minutes
3. 30 minutes - 1 hour
4. over 1 hour

11. How is this travelling done?

0. not applicable
1. car
2. public transit
3. walk
4. other (specify) _____

_____

12. Is this child care arrangement convenient for you or your spouse (if applicable) to reach?

0. not applicable
1. yes
2. no

13. Do the hours of operation of your child care arrangements limit the hours that either you or your spouse can work?

0. not applicable
1. self
2. spouse
3. both
4. neither

14. If you had the choice, would you prefer to have your child care arrangements for each child

1. close to home
2. close to work
3. on the way to your work
4. near the local school
5. other (specify) _____

Child 1 _____

Child 2 _____

Child 3 _____

15. Approximately how much does it cost you each week for the arrangements you have?

Child 1 _____

Child 2 _____

Child 3 _____

16. Are you subsidized for this cost?

0. not applicable
1. yes
2. no

17. Is the cost of your present child care arrangements a strain on your family budget?

0. not applicable
1. yes
2. no

18. Do you feel the cost is fair or reasonable?

0. not applicable
1. yes
2. no, too high
3. no, too low

19. Have you, over the past 12 months been forced to make changes in your child care arrangements for your child(ren)?

Child 1	1.	Yes	2.	No
Child 2	1.	Yes	2.	No
Child 3	1.	Yes	2.	No

20. Have you, over the past 12 months, had difficulty with finding emergency or temporary child care arrangements for your child(ren)?

Child 1	1.	Yes	2.	No
Child 2	1.	Yes	2.	No
Child 3	1.	Yes	2.	No

21. Do you change (any of) your child care arrangements for the summer?

    1. Yes 2. No

22. If yes to Q21, have you, either last summer or this one had difficulty in making these arrangements?

    0. not applicable
    1. yes
    2. no

23. If yes to Q22, what were those difficulties?

    0. not applicable

    or

    _____

    _____

    _____

24. What would you do in case your child became ill and had to remain home for one day?

    1. I would stay home
    2. A member of my immediate family would care for the child on an unpaid basis.
    3. A member of my immediate family would care for the child on a paid basis.
    4. Another person would care for the child on an unpaid basis.
    5. Another person would care for the child on a paid basis.
    6. Other (specify) _____

    _____

    9. Don't know

25. How satisfactory would that be to you and to your spouse?

    1. very unsatisfactory
    2. unsatisfactory
    3. undecided
    4. satisfactory
    5. very satisfactory

    self _____

    spouse _____

26. What would you do in case your child became ill and had to remain at home for a longer period? (1-2 weeks).

1. I would stay home.
2. A member of my immediate family would care for the child on an unpaid basis.
3. A member of my immediate family would care for the child on a paid basis.
4. Another person would care for the child on an unpaid basis.
5. Another person would care for the child on a paid basis.
6. Other (specify) _____

_____

9. Don't know

27. How satisfactory would that be to you and to your spouse?

1. very unsatisfactory
2. unsatisfactory
3. undecided
4. satisfactory
5. very satisfactory

self _____

spouse _____

28. What would you do if your present child care arrangements were unavailable for one day? (i.e. caregiver ill)

1. I would stay home.
2. A member of my immediate family would care for the child.
3. Another person would care for the child.
4. Other (specify) _____

_____

0. Don't know

29. How satisfactory would that be to you and your spouse?

1. very unsatisfactory
2. unsatisfactory
3. undecided
4. satisfactory
5. very satisfactory

self _____

spouse _____

30. What would you do if your present child care arrangements ended, until such time that you could locate other stable arrangements?

1. I would stay home
2. A member of my immediate family would care for the child.
3. Another person would care for the child
4. Other (specify) _____

_____

9. Don't know

31. How satisfactory would that be to you and to your spouse?

1. very unsatisfactory
2. unsatisfactory
3. undecided
4. satisfactory
5. very satisfactory

self _____

spouse _____

32. Over the past 6 months (from the beginning of January 1976 until now), have you had to take <u>any</u> time at all off work due to your child(ren)'s illnesses?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, can you remember approximately how many days?

33. Over the past 6 months (from the beginning of January 1976 until now), has your spouse had to take <u>any</u> time at all off work due to your child(ren)'s illnesses?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, can you remember approximately how many days?

34. Over the past 6 months (from the beginning of January 1976 until now),have you had to take <u>any</u> time at all off work due to either a temporary or permanent breakdown in your child care arrangements?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, can you remember approximately how many days?

35. When you took off work due to child care difficulties, was this marked as sick leave or vacation leave?

0. not applicable
1. sick leave
2. vacation leave
3. other (specify) _____

_____

36. Over the past 6 months (from the beginning of January 1976 until now), has your spouse had to take <u>any</u> time at all off work due to either a temporary or permanent breakdown in your child care arrangements?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, can you remember approximately how many days?

37. If you had your way and there were no financial or other obstacles, would you change your child care arrangements?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, why?

38. Do you worry about your present child care arrangements (for any of your children)?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, what do you worry about?

39. Does your job ever involve overtime work?

1. frequently
2. occasionally
3. never

40. Have you ever turned down overtime or just not worked it because of your child care arrangements?

1. turned down
2. not applied
3. both
4. neither

41. Have you ever turned down or not applied for another job because of your child care arrangements?

1. turned down
2. not applied
3. both
4. neither

41A. Does your job involve travelling?

1. yes
2. no

41B. Have you ever turned down travelling because of your child care arrangements?

0. not applicable
1. yes
2. no

41C. If so, has this had any adverse effect on your job?

0. not applicable
1. yes (specify)
2. no

_____

_____

42. Since you began working for the Civil Service have you ever taken any courses, either through the Ministry, Division or Branch, or Civil Service Commission, or any work-related courses through outside educational institutions or professional associations?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, did your child care arrangements hinder this effort in any way?

0. not applicable
1. yes (specify) _____

_____

2. no

If no, were your child care arrangements the determining factor in your decision not to take courses?

0. not applicable
1. yes (specify) _____

_____

2. no

43. Would you take a course if your child care arrangements did not interfere?

0. not applicable
1. yes
2. no

44. Have your child care arrangements caused any pressures, either minor or major, in your family relationships?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, please comment.

NOW SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF.

45. Sex 1. male 2. female

46. What is your present position?

1. managerial/supervisory
2. professional/technical
3. secretarial/clerical

47. What is your age?

1. under 20
2. 20 - 24
3. 25 - 29
4. 30 - 34
5. 35 - 39
6. 30 - 44
7. 45 - 49
8. 50 - 54
9. 55 and over

48. What is the age of your spouse?

0. not applicable
1. under 20
2. 20 - 24
3. 25 - 29
4. 30 - 34
5. 35 - 39
6. 40 - 44
7. 45 - 49
8. 50 - 54
9. 55 and over

49. Would you please look at this sheet and show me in what category your educational background falls?
_____ *(page 43)*

50. Would you please look at the same sheet and show me in what category your spouse's education falls?
_____ *(page 43)*

51. Finally, could you please look at this sheet and show me in what category your total family income falls? This includes the earnings of both you and your spouse.
_____ *(page 43)*

52. Do you support the idea of a day care centre at Queen's Park?

1. yes
2. no

53. Would you use such a facility if one was available?

1. yes
2. no

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1. Some high school
2. Completed high school
3. Some university
4. Completed university (1st degree-bachelors or equivalent)
5. Post-secondary (non-university)
6. Graduate degree work or degree

Specify:

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

1. $ 6,500 - $ 9,999
2. 10,000 - 13,999
3. 14,000 - 17,999
4. 18,000 - 21,999
5. 22,000 - 25,999
6. 26,000 - 29,999
7. 30,000 - 36,999
8. 37,000 +

APPENDIX E

Interview Questions for Managers

1. As a manager, are you aware of any employees with daycare problems?

   If so, what sort?

2. Have any of your employees phoned in to say they have to take the day off either because their child is sick or because of daycare problems?

   If yes, how frequently does this happen?

3. Have any of your employees ever had to not work overtime because of their child care arrangements?

4. Have any of your employees ever had to turn down travelling because of their child care arrangements?

5. Have any of your employees not taken courses because of their child care arrangements?

6. Do you feel that any of your employees haven't applied for jobs or haven't been considered for jobs because of their child care arrangements?

*7. Do you support the idea of a day care facility at Queen's Park for government employees?

8. Do you have any general comments?

* Only 2 managers were asked this question.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bennett, James.
"Child care and parental elave should be a fact of life," Financial Post. 1975

Blalock Jr., Hubert M.
Social Statistics. McGraw Hill, Toronto, 1972.

Breitbart, Vicki.
The Daycare Book: The Why, What and How of Community Daycare.
Alfred Knopf Inc., New York, 1974

Canadian Council on Social Development
Daycare: Report of a National Study by the CCSD.
Ottawa, January, 1972.

Canadian Welfare Council.
The Daycare of Children: an Annotated Bibliography.
Ottawa, June, 1969.

Committee on Government Productivity.
"Utilization of Human Resources in the Ontario Public Service," Interim Report Number Six. Toronto, April 1972.

Economic Council of Canada.
People and Jobs. A Study of the Canadian Labour Market. Information Canada, Ottawa, 1976.

Health and Welfare Canada.
Daycare: A Resource for the Contemporary Family.
Papers and proceedings of a seminar, September, 1969.
Ottawa, 1974.

Hepworth, H. Philip.
Personel Social Services in Canada: A Review.(Vol. II).
CCSD, Ottawa, 1975.

Landucci, Nola.
"Children - who cares?" Interaction. Vol. 4, No. 2.
Public Service Canada, December, 1975.

Levitan, Sar A. & Karen Cleary Alderman.
Child Care & ABC's Too. John Hopkins University Press, London, 1975.

Moser, C. A.
Survey Methods in Social Investigation.
Heinemann, London, 1963.

National Day Care Information Centre.
"Status of Day Care in Canada 1974", Summer, 1974.

"Day Care: Guide to Reading". Health and Welfare Canada, Ottawa, 1975.

Project Child Care.
Family Day Care: An Annotated Bibliography.
Community Day Care Coalition of Metro Toronto and the Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto.
September, 1975.

Roberts, Elma.
"Report of the Daycare Counselling Service for Ontario Government Employees in Metro Toronto", Ontario Ministry of Labour, Women's Programs Division, January 14, 1975.

Roby, Pamela ed.
Childcare - Who Cares? Foreign and Domestic Infant and Early Childhood Development Policies. Basic Books, 1973.

Selltiz, Claire, et al.
Research Methods in Social Relations. Holt Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1962.

Sibbald, Patricia A.
The Process of Problem Formulation. University of Toronto School of Social Work, Spring, 1968.

Sjoberg, Gideon and Roger Nett.
A Methodology for Social Research. Harper & Row, New York. 1968.

Social Planning Council and the Community Daycare Coalition of Metro Toronto.
"Private Arrangements: A Study of Unsupervised Child Care in Metro Toronto". December, 1974.

Stein, Susan.
"The Company Cares for Children", Child Care - Who Cares? (Pamela Roby ed.) pp. 245-261.

Women's Bureau.
Mothers in the Labour Force: Their Child Care Arrangements. Manitoba Department of Labour, September, 1974.

HV
861
.C3
.R68

Ross, Ruth.

"Child care and the working parent".

PY